

Subject: Re: [TZM CORE] RBE or RBEM or what

From: Kari <karin.e.mcgregor@gmail.com>

Date: 23/07/2012 2:31 AM

To: tzm-core-team@googlegroups.com

Just to add a little context - we've been networking with a number of other systems design groups - most notably Quest 2025 and Priocracy, which are so similar to RBE it's not funny. Very refreshing I must say - when you can talk to academics running institutes and all's they can say is "yeah - absolutely", nodding along to everything you mention, and nothing really has them going "but...what about...?!"

Anyways - coming to my point - the point is, when we're communicating with academics and intellectuals - those with whom we may at some point wish to collaborate, or at least establish a healthy reputation among, we need to be able to communicate in terms on their level - i.e. a whole systems approach. Therefore, the definition of the RBE becomes more complex than what we talk about with Joe Public and what's on the website FAQs, etc. Also more complex than anything I've seen in any of our TZM team lectures. I think we need to have these conversations if we are to hope to reach the next level in our communication and development with the outside world.

Basically, if a system is defined as an interaction of a number of elements or components that necessarily must interact in a symbiotic manner then the greater question becomes "what are these components?", and "is the system independent, or nested within another?"

The second question is easier to answer - of course all man-made systems are nested within Mother Nature's (I hope no one minds my hippy-ish reference to mumsy in these terms - just a lifetime of such habit is hard to break!) system - i.e. the ecosystem - and therefore everything that takes place is subject to Mother Nature's laws and the system cannot be sustainable unless it operates in accordance with these laws. To me this means Mother Nature is the only dictator I will accept ;-) and that she doesn't come to the negotiating table no matter how much we may want her to ;-) So - acting within the carrying capacity of our landbase (not just in arrogant human population terms, but with the recognition of all symbiotic elements of Mother Nature's system, as that is the only method that is realistic) is the bottom line for sustainability, and the scientific method of inquiry is our tool for understanding how to do this. I guess all this is obvious, right?

So - onto the next point - what are the components of a system? This one may be a little harder to answer, and lemme give a hint - it's nothing to do with tech - tech is just tools to make components function more efficiently, but needs to run in accordance with our carrying capacity with the recognition that all resources are finite and cannot be recycled indefinitely unless the laws of thermodynamics turn out to be wrong - or unless there is a gaping hole in scientific understanding that needs to be filled regarding how to harness spent energy (hmmmm - I'm not into the free energy discussions that go on in some circles within the Movement....). Anyways - I digress too soon... it's not about technology, but about the technical structure of a sustainable system - technological and technical NOT being synonymous.

Back to the point - what are the components of a system? I tend to think of the components as being 3-fold (not meaning to allude, by accident, to Steiner's social threefolding approach in which he identifies economy, rights - or politics, and culture as the 3 "spheres" of a system - I only recently found out that Steiner's

systems outline is similar to my own understanding, although the actual nuts n bolts of it are quite different). By this I mean that there are 3 driving forces of a system - the economic system, the governance structure, and the harmonious cultural values system. When these 3 forces are working in symbiosis with one another we have a sustainable system that remains within the carrying capacity of our landbase and nurtures that which nurtures us.

So - if it is agreed (which it may not be, but I have yet to find academics who fundamentally disagree) that these 3 factors are what makes up a system, then 2 more questions arise. 1 - what is the nature and process of each of these elements in the RBEM (I like a reasonable level of detail, which is necessary when we converse with academics and intellectuals who obviously find the FAQ stuff simplistic and lacking in depth (of course - it's just an FAQ) - not just contrast with the current system)? 2 - How can it be demonstrated that these elements, as defined within any particular model, are sustainable or likely to be sustainable? As a teaser, I identify the economic model as functioning in terms of landbase management (Murray Lane's Carrying Capacity Dashboard may prove useful in measuring this), providing equitable resource access (this is where the non-monetary trade-free bit comes in), and interconnected (world without borders, etc); the governance structure as necessarily scientifically managed (not politically lobbied), non-coercive, and equitable (participatory and decentralized); and the sociocultural harmony bit as being rooted in an ethics-based value system, with internal dynamics facilitating a healthy macro-culture, and a constantly evolving critical thinking system of inquiry and development. There is a lot more depth that could be attained regarding the description of all of these elements and sub-elements, how they function, how they are maintained, and how they could be transitioned to. I don't have all the answers there, and am hoping to gather some collective intelligence here.

Anyways - I can elaborate much more if anyone would like me to - I have a 2hr presentation tailored to systems design-oriented groups that deals with the elements of a sustainable symbiotic system that works pretty well, and could talk about the subject for hours without getting bored (I iz nerd...) :-P Just let me know if you'd like more to chew on in response ;-)

That's probably enough for now, and hopefully I've finally clarified the level and depth of discussion I think we should be engaging in here! :-)

Cheers,

K McGregor

On 7/23/2012 12:30 AM, Brandy Hume wrote:

Just wondering, are you asking these questions for yourself? Or do you know the answers but you feel they need to be explained and written/published more clearly for the public? If it's the latter, then we can work on a more structured document, but for the purpose of discussion I will offer my 2 cents for what it's worth. ;)

Idk about the "Earth Economy" thing. I like it as an explanation or alternative term, but I don't think we should necessarily go about 'switching' to any one term; I think "RBE" works fine. (On a side note which stuck out to me personally, but everyone may not feel this way... I think relying solely on the plain & simple term "Earth Economy" bears a similarity to Earth Ships, and "Earth"-everything-else, and we may,

in some cases, forgo the opportunity to actually explain what it is if people assume they already know.)

>How do we avoid the bias in the governance that comes from culture by people who are raised in the same culture?<

I don't understand the question. Are you asking how we avoid bias of decision-making processes, and of people with leadership roles (i.e. scientists) in the RBE, who were raised in the RBE? Or are you asking how we avoid bias of people who were raised in the monetary system? If by "bias that comes from culture," you are referring to bias that comes from any culture, at all, then I'm not understanding the source of, or nature of, the supposed bias in the RBE.

>Credentials - how these are evaluated/granted in RBEM?<

I could be wrong, but with the obvious exception of dramatically improved educational materials (field trips/exploration, hands-on, available computers & gadgets, etc.) and processes in general, I see no reason why it should be all that different from the steps we use today. No one needs their credentials to obtain a "job" and earn a living, so the students' only desire should be to learn and be good at what they do, and there should be no incentive to simply "pass the test" to be accepted by society. From my understanding, we don't plan to eliminate processes for establishing that someone knows what they're doing before being allowed to operate on someone, or modify the components of a public transportation system. And no one should want to, unless they want to risk harming other people for no logical reason. I imagine there will still have to be some sort of testing and or qualification process, which could be automated.

>How we can not be perceived as hypocrites when we advocate a system that has never been proven to work (agreeably there is a lot suggesting that it would, but that's not how science works) and at the same time advocate the scientific method?<

I don't buy that. When scientists test a product, they don't test 7 billion of them, they only test one (or some limited number) and then they mass produce it if it works. Same goes for the *components* of the RBE (food production, housing, transportation, etc.) that make up the global RBE. If a maglev train goes from A to B, then we can deduce that with the appropriate measurements we can construct one that will go from A to Z. That's from a technical standpoint. From an economical standpoint (and this is the kicker, IMO), people claim that we haven't tested/proven this central computer system and/or decision-making process, but the fact of the matter is that with the right information, we can "arrive at" more intelligent decisions even now, than we can with a market system. Having accurate surveys of the Earth's resources and of everyone's input would just make it all that much more accurate and efficient. Nobody ever "tested" the market system and everyone uses that without any arguments; it just evolved out of necessity, and now we are evolving into something new because we can. If anything you could argue that other civilizations before us (i.e. Native Americans) have already proven that sharing works and hence they didn't fight amongst each other in their own tribes, and enjoyed their own versions of "abundance," while all of the wars (over land, resources, etc.) combined with our disregard for the planet, have proven that the market doesn't - assuming that the goal is to preserve life and the values that sustain it.

>How do we address the argument of previous similar movements/systems that have failed? (like the Icarians)<

I'm not aware of any similar Movements, and while this is the first I'm hearing of the Icarians, I can see at first glance that it's not even close. The most obvious differences are that their Movement took place in the 19th century, so technological abundance (on the scale we are advocating) wasn't even a possibility, and their political structure "consisted on one president who was elected annually, and four officers each in charge of finance, farming, industry and education. Prospective members of the community were admitted by a majority vote of adult males." (There they go with that darn voting again... ;) "This was after the prospective member had lived in the society for four months and pledged \$80." (There they go with that money again...) Members were required to forfeit all of their property." Ok, really?? :P

>Chapters often speak about "furthering the cause" or "planing for the future" but what are we exactly doing apart from spreading awareness about ourselves and some of the problems of today system? Or is the movement expecting for a RBEM to evolve somehow from spreading education alone? and if that's true - how does that exactly work in our eyes?<

I wouldn't say that the Movement is necessarily "expecting" an RBE to evolve from spreading education ALONE (alone being the keyword here), but I would definitely say it's the primary factor here. I would go so far as to say that if we don't focus on it, then any other resources toward the RBE (volunteers, donations, scientists, etc.) are null and void... if they ever even come about... which they won't, without spreading awareness. In *my* eyes ;-) it is through spreading awareness that people and organizations with the means to do anything about it will start to come forward, and nothing is to say that we can't approach them as well, but again that falls under the same category as spreading awareness. I think the important point here, to avoid being too wordy, is that one of the only things we can do right now *is* spread awareness, in order to preserve the integrity of the very idea we're advocating. Trying to further our cause or "prove our point" through haphazard communes, premature technological prototypes, etc. would only do more harm than good. This is spoken from a very broad perspective. Obviously there are steps we can take within the realm of "spreading awareness" that involve establishing information databases and improving our organization and effectiveness. But on a technical level, I don't believe we have many cards to play.

-Brandy

On Jul 22, 2012, at 3:17 AM, David Z wrote:

ok, there is quite few of them - lets start with the usage "earth economy" by PJ on his ted talk. Why the change of names? And can chapters use that terms as well? are we free with using both, or having no term but just the definition? When reviewing the sites, should i ask for all RBE entries to be changed to RBEM or Earth Economy or... what should my explanation be exactly?

How do we avoid the bias in the governance that comes from culture by people who are raised in the same culture?

Credentials - how these are evaluated/granted in RBEM?

How we can not be perceived as hypocrites when we advocate a system that has never been proven to work (agreeably there is a lot suggesting that it would, but that's not how science works) and at the same time advocate the scientific method?

How do we address the argument of previous similar movements/systems that have failed? (like the Icarians)

Chapters often speak about "furthering the cause" or "planing for the future" but what are we exactly doing apart from spreading awareness about ourselves and some of the problems of today system? Or is the movement expecting for a RBEM to evolve somehow from spreading education alone? and if that's true - how does that exactly work in our eyes?

On 22/07/2012 12:09 PM, Andrés Delgado wrote:

It's pretty clear but I do understand your point. Let's do this: ask those question you see can't be answered with the current info.

Saludos,

Andrés Delgado

El 21/07/2012, a las 20:38, "Kari" <karin.e.mcgregor@gmail.com> escribió:

That's not really very detailed as it's juts an FAQ for visitors to the websites, and, as stated before, we are clear on the content of the FAQs - it's not hard for us to read stuff that we've put on our own sites ;-)

The point is we've never actually had a discussion of the nitty-gritty (I raised this in a core-team meeting a while back after the Systems Design Studio we attended in QLD, but didn't get much traction), having only ever received information from either Jacque or PJ. Most of our info is just packaged in a way that can be communicated on a basic level to Joe Public, but is not in enough depth for an audience of academics, which tends to be what a lot of my audiences are these days. We'd really like some intellectual discussion on this from within the team that goes beyond the basic outline.

Cheers,

K McGregor

On 7/22/2012 10:53 AM, Andrés Delgado wrote:

Reas The Other FAQ defining the central characteristics of a rbem

Saludos,

Andrés Delgado

El 21/07/2012, a las 19:18, "David Z" <david.z@zeitgeistaustralia.org> escribió:

Earth Economy sounds definitely much better

On 22/07/2012 2:20 AM, Kari wrote:

Oops - just realised I might need a clarification here so as not to appear unintentionally raciamalist.... I said "white western society" because the concept or RBE has been in existence in Aboriginal cultures, at least here in Australia, for thousands of years before white man had the arrogance to claim ownership of anything - including chunks of language ;-)

We've been spending a little time digging beneath the surface of our indigenous brothers and sisters here in Aus (spending some time in the desert - which we intend to do more of - making the connections and educating ourselves in a way that can really strengthen our direction here) and are learning heaps - I always kinda knew they'd done it before, but wasn't really clear on the extent or clarity of their understanding of whole systems before... how naive and arrogant I was!! ;-)

K McGregor

On 7/22/2012 2:14 AM, Kari wrote:

I think David's actual intention, if I'm not mistaken, was really to stimulate discussion of the usage of the term/s. Of course he's familiar with the FAQs that are on our website, as with any other that adheres to guidelines, so I don't think he'd be asking something as basic as that.

The term RBE as an invention of Jacque Fresco is actually debatable. The origin of the concept in white western society can be traced back to the 1700s, and the origin of the term to the beginning of the 1900s. Jacque Fresco took up what was already in existence conceptually speaking, hence does not have a technical legal right to copyright of the term (also due to its common usage in application to an economy based on resource trading - as many economists understand it). For this reason the choice of whether to use RBE or RBEM based on TVP's claim to the term is up for discussion, as are any other terms we may prefer to use (one of which appears in PJ's TEDx Ojai lecture - Earth Economy, which I like the sound of, and feel may well resonate with more

people).

Anyways - the purpose of the question was to stimulate discussion of what term we prefer to use, if, indeed, we feel a need to arrive at consensus

K McGregor

On 7/22/2012 1:54 AM, Andrés Delgado wrote:

Please read this FAQ <http://www.thezeitgeistmovement.com/faq#faq8> the last paragraph RBE vs RBEM

Saludos Cordiales,

jorge.andr3s

Movimiento Zeitgeist Ecuador - Sostenibilidad, No Violencia & Método Científico - www.zeitgeistec.com

--

Global Chapters status and to-do list:

<https://trello.com/board/tzm-global-core/4f77abf5b625547d2808c0f1>

Worldwide chapters contacts and data spreadsheet:

<https://docs.google.com/spreadsheet/ccc?key=0AkgDKF--mcLjdDdUa0FBR1BqQlhpbzI3VnduS09tT1E#gid=2>

TZM Core List of Concerns:

https://docs.google.com/document/d/1VF9wS5MRIK_2lAW2rKvU3oop8owKrysGkLjZZyyFTlw/edit

--

Global Chapters status and to-do list:

<https://trello.com/board/tzm-global-core/4f77abf5b625547d2808c0f1>

Worldwide chapters contacts and data spreadsheet:

<https://docs.google.com/spreadsheet/ccc?key=0AkgDKF--mcLjdDdUa0FBR1BqQlhpbzI3VnduS09tT1E#gid=2>

TZM Core List of Concerns:

[https://docs.google.com/document
/d/1VF9wS5MRIK_2lAW2rKvU3oop8owKrysGkLjZZyyFTlw/edit](https://docs.google.com/document/d/1VF9wS5MRIK_2lAW2rKvU3oop8owKrysGkLjZZyyFTlw/edit)

--

Global Chapters status and to-do list:

<https://trello.com/board/tzm-global-core/4f77abf5b625547d2808c0f1>

Worldwide chapters contacts and data spreadsheet:

[https://docs.google.com/spreadsheets/ccc?key=0AkgDKF--
mcLjdDdUa0FBR1BqQlhpbzI3VnduS09tT1E#gid=2](https://docs.google.com/spreadsheets/ccc?key=0AkgDKF--mcLjdDdUa0FBR1BqQlhpbzI3VnduS09tT1E#gid=2)

TZM Core List of Concerns:

[https://docs.google.com/document
/d/1VF9wS5MRIK_2lAW2rKvU3oop8owKrysGkLjZZyyFTlw/edit](https://docs.google.com/document/d/1VF9wS5MRIK_2lAW2rKvU3oop8owKrysGkLjZZyyFTlw/edit)

--

Global Chapters status and to-do list:

<https://trello.com/board/tzm-global-core/4f77abf5b625547d2808c0f1>

Worldwide chapters contacts and data spreadsheet:

[https://docs.google.com/spreadsheets/ccc?key=0AkgDKF--
mcLjdDdUa0FBR1BqQlhpbzI3VnduS09tT1E#gid=2](https://docs.google.com/spreadsheets/ccc?key=0AkgDKF--mcLjdDdUa0FBR1BqQlhpbzI3VnduS09tT1E#gid=2)

TZM Core List of Concerns:

[https://docs.google.com/document
/d/1VF9wS5MRIK_2lAW2rKvU3oop8owKrysGkLjZZyyFTlw/edit](https://docs.google.com/document/d/1VF9wS5MRIK_2lAW2rKvU3oop8owKrysGkLjZZyyFTlw/edit)

--

Global Chapters status and to-do list:

<https://trello.com/board/tzm-global-core/4f77abf5b625547d2808c0f1>

Worldwide chapters contacts and data spreadsheet:

<https://docs.google.com/spreadsheet/ccc?key=0AkgDKF--mcLjdDdUa0FBR1BqQlhpbzI3VnduS09tT1E#gid=2>

TZM Core List of Concerns:

https://docs.google.com/document/d/1VF9wS5MRIK_2lAW2rKvU3oop8owKrysGkLjZZyyFTlw/edit

--

Global Chapters status and to-do list:

<https://trello.com/board/tzm-global-core/4f77abf5b625547d2808c0f1>

Worldwide chapters contacts and data spreadsheet:

<https://docs.google.com/spreadsheet/ccc?key=0AkgDKF--mcLjdDdUa0FBR1BqQlhpbzI3VnduS09tT1E#gid=2>

TZM Core List of Concerns:

https://docs.google.com/document/d/1VF9wS5MRIK_2lAW2rKvU3oop8owKrysGkLjZZyyFTlw/edit

--

Global Chapters status and to-do list:

<https://trello.com/board/tzm-global-core/4f77abf5b625547d2808c0f1>

Worldwide chapters contacts and data spreadsheet:

<https://docs.google.com/spreadsheet/ccc?key=0AkgDKF--mcLjdDdUa0FBR1BqQlhpbzI3VnduS09tT1E#gid=2>

TZM Core List of Concerns:

https://docs.google.com/document/d/1VF9wS5MRIK_2lAW2rKvU3oop8owKrysGkLjZZyyFTlw/edit

~Brandy~

You can find me on:

[FACEBOOK](#) | [TWITTER](#) | [YOUTUBE](#)

[BLOGGER](#) | [MYSPACE](#) | [VIMEO](#)

--

Global Chapters status and to-do list:

<https://trello.com/board/tzm-global-core/4f77abf5b625547d2808c0f1>

Worldwide chapters contacts and data spreadsheet:

<https://docs.google.com/spreadsheet/ccc?key=0AkgDKF--mcLjdDdUa0FBR1BqQlhpbzI3VnduS09tT1E#gid=2>

TZM Core List of Concerns:

https://docs.google.com/document/d/1VF9wS5MRIK_2lAW2rKvU3oop8owKrysGkLjZZyyFTlw/edit